

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
JANUARY 9 and 10, 2007**

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at its courtroom, located at 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on January 9 and 10, 2007.

**TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2007—9:00 A.M.**

- |     |         |   |
|-----|---------|---|
| (1) | S127344 | People v. Cage (Lisa Marie)   |
| (2) | S142496 | Jacob B. v. County of Shasta  |
| (3) | S132251 | Mt. San Jacinto Comm. College Dist. v. Superior Court<br>(Azusa Pacific University, Real Party in Interest) |

**WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2007—9:00 A.M.**

- |     |         |                                     |
|-----|---------|-------------------------------------|
| (4) | S131879 | People v. Lowe (Daniel)             |
| (5) | S123980 | In re Sheena K./People v. Sheena K. |
| (6) | S140865 | In re Jesus O.                      |

\_\_\_\_\_  
GEORGE  
*Chief Justice*

If exhibits are to be transmitted to this court, counsel must comply with rule 8.224(c) (formerly rule 18(c)) of the California Rules of Court.

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
JANUARY 9 and 10, 2007**

The following case summaries are issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has scheduled for oral argument and of their general subject matter. Generally, the descriptions set out below are reproduced from the original news release issued when review in each of these matters was granted and are provided for the convenience of the public and the press. The descriptions do not necessarily reflect the view of the court or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.

**TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2007—9:00 A.M.**

***(1) People v. Cage (Lisa Marie), S127344***

#04-111 People v. Cage (Lisa Marie), S127344. (E034242; 120 Cal.App.4th 770; Superior Court of Riverside County; RIF097168.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case includes the following issue: Are *all* statements made by an ostensible crime victim to a police officer in response to general investigative questioning “testimonial hearsay” within the meaning of *Crawford v. Washington* (2004) 541 U.S. 36, 124 S.Ct. 1354 and inadmissible in the absence of an opportunity to cross-examine the declarant, or does “testimonial hearsay” include only statements made in response to a formal interview at a police station?

***(2) Jacob B. v. County of Shasta, S142496***

#06-63 Jacob B. v. County of Shasta, S142496. (C049794; 137 Cal.App.4th 225; Superior Court of Shasta County; 149219.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case includes the following issue: Does the litigation privilege of Civil Code section 47(b) bar a cause of action under the state Constitution for invasion of privacy?

***(3) Mt. San Jacinto Comm. College Dist. v. Superior Court (Azusa Pacific University, Real Party in Interest), S132251***

#05-111 Mt. San Jacinto Comm. College Dist. v. Superior Court (Azusa Pacific University, Real Party in Interest), S132251. (E035868; 126 Cal.App.4th 619; Superior Court of Riverside County; RIC349900.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted a petition for peremptory writ of mandate. This case presents the following issue: In a “quick take” eminent domain proceeding (Code Civ. Proc., § 1263.110 et seq.), in which the condemnor deposits “probable compensation” for the property and has a right to take possession before any issues are tried, as of what date should the value of the property be determined when the owner of the property does not exercise its right to withdraw the funds and instead litigates the condemnor’s right to take the property?

**WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2007—9:00 A.M.**

***(4) People v. Lowe (Daniel), S131879***

#05-119 People v. Lowe (Daniel), S131879. (H026889; 126 Cal.App.4th 1365; Superior Court of Santa Clara County; CC303969.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order setting aside an information. This case presents the following issue: Can a delay of five months in serving an arrest warrant on a defendant already serving another sentence constitute sufficient prejudice to support the defendant’s claim that he was denied his state constitutional right to a speedy trial by being deprived of the possibility of concurrent sentences in the two cases?

***(5) In re Sheena K./People v. Sheena K., S123980***

#04-60 In re Sheena K./People v. Sheena K., S123980. (B167626; 116 Cal.App.4th 436; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; KJ19106.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed orders in a wardship proceeding. This case presents the following issues: Is a challenge to a condition of juvenile probation as unconstitutionally vague or overbroad waived or forfeited by the failure to object to the condition at the time of the dispositional hearing in juvenile court? If there is no waiver or forfeiture, is a

probation condition that a minor “not associated with anyone disapproved of by [her] probation [officer]” unconstitutionally vague or overboard?

**(6) *In re Jesus O.*, S140865**

#06-42 *In re Jesus O.*, S140865. (B177869; 135 Cal.App.4th 237; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; PJ34851.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed orders in a wardship proceeding. This case presents the following issue: Is the crime of grand theft *from the person* committed when an assault causes the victim to drop his or her property and the perpetrator takes the property after the victim flees?

#